

#### REMARKS/ARGUMENTS

Independent claim 1 is now pending, and is currently amended. Claim 1 stands rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 102. Dependent claims 3, 5, 7, 8 and 9 are also pending, and are now canceled. New dependent claim 10 has been added.

Claims 2 and 4 were previously canceled. Claim 6 was previously withdrawn from consideration when Applicant elected without traverse to prosecute the claims of Group 1, claims 1-5.

Applicant respectfully requests reconsideration of the application.

#### I. Independent Claim 1

1. (currently amended) A plastic syringe barrel, comprising:  
a nozzle portion in which an outer cylinder and an inner cylinder are formed, and  
a luer lock portion formed in the nozzle portion and between an inner peripheral surface of the outer cylinder and an outer peripheral surface of the inner cylinder,  
wherein the outer cylinder is made of cyclic polyolefin resin,  
the inner peripheral surface of the outer cylinder contains a helically continuous screw thread, and  
the surface of the screw thread and/or of a screw root portion formed between adjacent ridges of the screw thread have/has a sandblasted surface.

As was previously acknowledged, Moncada et al. fail to teach that the material of the syringe barrel (including the outer cylinder of the nozzle portion) is made of cyclic polyolefin resin (01/11/2005 Office action, at 5), and Moncada et al. fail to teach that the inner peripheral surface of the outer cylinder has a roughened surface. (01/11/2005 Office action, at 4.) Thus, Moncada et al. does not teach that the inner peripheral surface of the outer cylinder contains a helically continuous screw thread that has a sandblasted surface, or that a screw root portion formed between adjacent ridges of the screw thread has a sandblasted surface.

Further, the Office action identifies no teaching or suggestion in the prior art to modify Moncada et al. to form a sandblasted surface on the helical threads on the inner peripheral surface of the outer cylinder. The mere statement that such a modification of Moncada et al. "would have been obvious to one of the ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention" is not sufficient to establish a prima facie case of obviousness without some objective reason to combine teachings of the prior art. (01/11/2005 Office action, at 4-5.) See M.P.E.P. § 2143.01.

Moreover, the teeth of Moncada et al. markedly increase the frictional force necessary to engage an extension tube or the like with the luer lock portion, and therefore may result in breakage of the outer cylinder made of cyclic polyolefin resin. The sandblasted surface of claim 1 allows for smooth engagement but with sufficient coefficient of friction to also firmly hold the extension tube in place. A sandblasted surface is also more appropriate than teeth to modify the syringe portions made of cyclic polyolefin resin – a stiff material that is easily broken.

The Office action also states that Porfano et al. teach that a syringe barrel is made of cyclic polyolefin copolymer resin. (01/11/2005 Office action, at 5.) But there is no teaching

Application Serial No. 09/047,279  
Attorney Docket No. 114474.00013  
Amendment Dated April 11, 2005  
Amendment and Response to Office Action

or suggestion in the art to combine Moncada et al. – an adapter for mounting a needle guard on a syringe – with Porfano et al., which discloses methods and apparatus for maintaining a locally controlled, clean environment for various operations in assembly of medical devices. (Col. 2, lines 6-12) The mere fact that references can be combined does not render the resultant combination obvious unless the prior art also suggests the desirability of the combination. *See* MPEP § 2143.03.

With regard to the recitation “formed by blast treatment” in rejected claims 1, 5 and 7, the Office action states that “the method of forming the syringe barrel is not germane to the issue of patentability of the syringe barrel itself.” (01/11/2005 Office action, at 2-3.) Applicant is unaware of any legal basis for discounting claim language. Indeed, the M.P.E.P. explicitly states that a functional limitation must be evaluated and considered, just like any other limitation of the claim. M.P.E.P. § 2173.05(g).

In sum, amended claim 1 is not anticipated, taught, or suggested by the prior art of record.

## II. Dependent Claim 10

10. (new) The plastic syringe barrel of claim 1, wherein the inner cylinder is made of cyclic polyolefin resin, and  
the outer peripheral surface of the inner cylinder has a sandblasted surface.

New dependent claim 10 recites features that further distinguish the art and is patentable with independent claim 1. New dependent claim 10 provides that the inner cylinder

Application Serial NO. 09/047,279  
Attorney Docket No. 114474.00013

Amendment Dated April 11, 2005

Amendment and Response to Office Action

of the nozzle is made of cyclic polyolefin resin and that the outer peripheral surface of the inner cylinder has a sandblasted surface.

In view of the amendments and remarks, Applicant respectfully submits that the claims are in condition for allowance, and requests that the application be approved for issuance.

In the event that an extension of time is required, Applicant petitions for that extension of time required to make this response timely. Kindly charge any additional fee, or credit any surplus, to Deposit Account No. 23-2405, Order No. 114474.00013.

Respectfully submitted,

WILLKIE FARR &amp; GALLAGHER, LLP

Dated: April 11, 2005By: 

Leslie M. Spencer

Registration No. 47,105

WILLKIE FARR &amp; GALLAGHER, LLP

787 Seventh Ave.

New York, New York 10019

212-728-8782

212-728-9782 Fax